REMARKS

Claims 18-22, 36 and 38-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Gillick et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,530,455, hereinafter Gillick). Claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gillick in view of Grant (U.S. Patent Number 5,854,624).

CLAIMS 18-22

Independent claim 18 provides a computer system capable of generating images on a display having a mouse and a computer readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing steps. The steps include generating at least one of five mouse input values, where each mouse input value is capable of having one of only two states and executing an application that displays document pages in a temporally serial manner on a display. The steps further include identifying when a first mouse input value is in a first state and when the first mouse input value is in a second state. Based on the first mouse input value being in the first state followed by the second state, the application is caused to display a previously displayed document page regardless of the position of the cursor on the display and regardless of other mouse input values.

In the Office Action, Gillick was cited to reject claim 18. In Gillick, a roller is used to scroll through documents and to switch between windows. The speed at which the scrolling is performed, or the type of scrolling, including page scrolling, can be controlled by pressing a button on the mouse while rolling the roller. Note that pressing the button without moving the roller does not cause a function to be performed. The roller must be moved in order for the windows to switch or for scrolling of any type to take place in Gillick.

This is substantially different from claim 18 in which the toggling of a mouse input value from a first state to a

second state causes a previously displayed document page to be displayed regardless of other mouse input values. Unlike Gillick, the invention of claim 18 does not require roller information to determine whether to scroll or to determine the direction and speed of scrolling. Instead, claim 18 causes a previously displayed document page to be displayed based on an input value going from a first state to a second state regardless of other mouse input values such as rollers. As such, claim 18 is patentably distinct from Gillick.

Further, it would not be obvious to modify Gillick to remove its dependency on the roller, since the roller gives the user greater flexibility in determining the speed and direction of scrolling.

In addition, claim 18 is not obvious from the combination of Gillick and Grant. In Grant, a new specialized input device is provided with specialized buttons designed specifically for an Internet browser. Grant teaches that specialized devices are needed because computer mice are designed for general use across a number of different applications and as such, the buttons on mice are not specialized for any one application. This teaches those skilled in the art that the buttons on mice should not be directed to specific applications but instead that entirely new input devices should be generated for individual applications, such as an Internet browser. As such, those skilled in the art would not combine the specialized buttons found in Grant's specialized device with a general application mouse as found in the present invention. Further, Grant does not show or suggest which of its many specialized buttons should be selected to be placed on a mouse given the limited space available on a mouse for such buttons.

Since the invention of claim 18 is not shown or suggested in either Gillick or Grant and is not obvious from the

combination of Gillick and Grant, claim 18 and claims 20-23 which depend therefrom are patentable over the cited art.

CLAIMS 36-39

Claim 36 provides a computer mouse that has a housing and at least one user depressible surface exposed on the housing for communicating a first command signal to a computer. The first command signal is associated with a paging back function of software whereby depression of the user depressible surface, regardless of other manipulations of the mouse, causes the software to page backward.

As noted above, Gillick does not show or suggest a depressible surface that causes software to page backward regardless of other manipulations of a mouse. In particular, Gillick requires that a roller be moved in order to cause software to scroll through document pages. Further, claim 36 is not obvious from Gillick or the combination of Gillick and Grant for the reasons discussed above for claim 18. As such, claims 36-39 are patentable over the cited art.

CLAIMS 40 AND 41

Independent claim 40 provides a computer mouse that has a button that is associated with a page back function such that depression of the button alone causes software to receive a page back message that initiates a page back function executed by the software. Software receives the page back message without the mouse cursor being located on a back button displayed on a monitor.

Claim 40 is not shown or suggested by Gillick or Grant. In particular, Gillick does not show that depression of a button alone causes software to receive a page back message. Instead, Gillick requires movement of a roller together with pressing of a button in order to form page scrolling instructions. Further,

claim 40 is not obvious from Gillick or the combination of Gillick and Grant for the reasons discussed above for claim 18. As such, claims 40 and 41 are patentable over the combination of Gillick and Grant.

CLAIMS 42 AND 43

Independent claim 42 provides a method of using a computer mouse that includes activating one of the buttons on the mouse to send a page back signal to the software, regardless of the cursor position on the display and regardless of other manipulations of the computer mouse. This page back signal causes execution of a page back function.

Claim 42 is not shown or suggested by Gillick or Grant. In particular, neither reference shows or suggests a button on a mouse that sends a page back signal to software regardless of the cursor position on the display and regardless of other manipulations of the computer mouse. In particular, Gillick does not show such a mouse because Gillick only sends a page scrolling instruction if a roller is rolled. Thus, Gillick requires manipulations of the computer mouse in order to cause a page scrolling function. Further, claim 42 is not obvious from Gillick or the combination of Gillick and Grant for the reasons discussed above for claim 18. Therefore, claims 42 and 43 are patentable over the combination of Gillick and Grant.

CLAIMS 44 AND 45

Independent claim 44 provides a method of operating software using a computer mouse. The method includes depressing at least one button on the mouse to send a page back signal to software for execution of the page back function regardless of the cursor position on the display and regardless of other manipulations of the computer mouse. Neither Gillick or Grant show the invention of claim 44. In particular, Gillick does not

show this invention since Gillick requires manipulation of the computer mouse's roller in order to form page scrolling commands. If the roller is not moved, the page scrolling commands are not issued. Further, claim 44 is not obvious from Gillick or the combination of Gillick and Grant for the reasons discussed above for claim 18. As such, Gillick does not send a page back signal with depression of a button regardless of other manipulations of the computer mouse.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, claims 18-23 and 36-45 are in form for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: _____
Theodore M. Magee, Reg. No. 39,758
Suite 1400 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

TMM:sew